



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Balkans will soon explode again." February 5 she stated: "Now they say a dagger is being prepared in Russia to stab Austria-Hungary in the back." Under date of May 11 there is this interesting statement: "The teachers of international law are going to strangle pacifism." The entries of those days reveal her struggle against the weakness of approaching old age. She describes with no little detail the worries which were besetting her during her last year of life. She seemed particularly anxious about the success of the Peace Congress which was to convene in Vienna in August, 1914.

A PARTY OF CONGRESSMEN, informally representing the United States, recently toured the leading cities of Japan and had many tokens of the courtesy that the Japanese so well know how to show. Now it is announced that next year delegations from the two chambers of the Diet will return the visit. Nor is this all. A large delegation of Japanese business men, headed by Baron Shibusawi and Mr. Otani, president of the Yokohama Chamber of Commerce, also is planning an American tour. We are not disposed to underestimate the value of these "tours." They provide an opportunity for contacts, that, however superficial and brief, do more or less break down racial antipathies, trade rivalries, and national chauvinism. But they usually have too much feasting, too much sentimental eloquence, and too much formality and politeness connected with them. They are not "realistic" enough in candor of speech, in thorough probing of facts, and in careful study of "things as they are." Governor Inouye, of the Kanagawa Prefecture, just as the American Congressmen were leaving Japan, seems to have sensed this need; for in an interview in the *Japan Times* we find him saying that the situation is best summed up by the Japanese proverb which says that "at one glance you get more than with a hundred hearings." Traveling incognito—assuming a miracle—walking in and out of typical American centers of population, urban and rural, and noting the every-day reactions of John Doe and Richard Roe to appeals for American loyalty to the creed of "The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man" would do more to enlighten Japanese publicists as to the real American desire for amity or for strife than innumerable banquets or visits to factories and schools.

NO AWARD OF THE NOBEL PEACE PRIZE has been granted since it went to Mr. Elihu Root in 1912 and to Senator Henri Lafontaine, of Belgium, in 1913. The dispatches now indicate that two awards of this amount, approximately \$45,000, are about to be made, one to the International Red Cross Committee at Geneva, another to President Wilson.

## THE MENACE OF BOLSHEVISM

By BARON S. A. KORFF, LL. D.

THERE IS A WAY to overcome the menace of Bolshevism. There is but one way.

Before stating the solution, let it be granted that the confusion of thought about the whole business is profound and well nigh complete. During these last months there has been no little loose talk about "Bolshevism." It has cropped up here and there, wherever "reactionaries" saw any danger to the so-called "existing order" or to their own established interests. At the least sign of dissatisfaction or social discontent, such people at once raise the cry of "Bolshevism." In the minds of these men Bolshevism is always identical with Socialism and often with Radicalism. They fail to see any differences between such teachings, often miles apart, as Socialism, Bolshevism, and Syndicalism.

Unfortunately, the other side is also often guilty of misrepresentation or conscious misstatements, mixing up conservatism with reaction. In this last respect there is an interesting and important psychological fact to be noted, namely, the absolute aversion of all radicals to admit truly the existence of Bolshevism, where it does exist, except as it certainly does, in Russia. In other words, we have the astounding medley—conservatives and reactionaries pointing out Bolshevik occurrences and developments where they really never exist, and radicals or socialists often concealing and denying Bolshevik events or facts in cases where they undoubtedly do prevail. No wonder that the casual reader, not well acquainted with world politics, is at a loss to know whom to believe.

It is important to recognize this confusion, as there really does exist a menace of Bolshevism confronting many a country. The danger is international, and, more important still, the menace is a contagious disease, that can be fought not by force, but by ideas only. This latter truth unluckily is realized by very few persons. Most people are quite content to use any sort of physical force to eradicate the growing social discontent, particularly the first signs of Bolshevism; and they are usually very much astonished, sometimes indignant, when this does not work, or, as sometimes happens, when it works the other way. The performances in the New York Assembly at Albany and the deportation of radicals are perhaps the most significant examples.

The Bolshevik danger does exist in the Third Internationale and the Communist teachings. It is fed exclusively through the growth of social discontent. The fight against this danger can be conducted only in two ways: by eradicating social evils, or at least lessening as far as possible their effect, and, secondly, by educating the people at large, and especially the discontented classes or groups, convincing them that Bolshevism or communistic teachings and ideals can never abate their injustices and sufferings.

The failures of Bolshevism in Russia are at last so well known that they could, without any difficulty, be used as a perfect demonstration of the futility of communistic dreams and vagaries. Education along these lines is needed even in the United States, in spite of the fact that no Bolshevism exists here.

This would also seem to be the best way of fighting the other evil, namely, reaction; for only the education of the people at large can protect them from hyper-conservative influences. Unfortunately, one must say, I fear, that too little is done in both respects in America at present. It is like the bad weather Mark Twain complained of—"Much is talked about it, but nothing really is done."

Only through educational methods can the Bolshevik teachings and ideals be made clear; only by studying them can one understand how utterly impossible they are in practice in the modern body politic. Yet one must sadly state that very little in such education has been accomplished. This is the only explanation, to my mind, why so very many people yet put their hopes on Bolshevik achievements. All the downtrodden or dissatisfied are easily tempted to follow the wildest leader, as long as he or his preachings hold out some alleviation of personal or social sufferings and privations. This is a well-known, humanity-embracing fact. That better-educated and thinking men can still cling to Bolshevism or defend its teachings cannot be explained otherwise than simply by lack of knowledge or by illusions created through the glitter of absolutely unrealizable promises. Often it is also a cry of despair, much less excusable.

#### Europe's Attitude

Quite otherwise do matters stand in European countries. Let us see what fate the Bolshevik teachings and influences had lately among the European people. France seemingly overcame the danger last winter and spring, and it is not likely to recur; the nation is tired of it and earnestly wants to set itself to the reconstruction work, so much needed after the devastations of the awful war. The French Socialist leaders, with only a very few exceptions, are wide awake to the Bolshevik dangers and are well acquainted with its fallacies. It is true that the political leaders of France are too prone to conduct a reactionary policy, explicable, perhaps, if one considers the former German danger, but certainly not excusable from the point of view of far-sighted statesmanship. Her agricultural small landholders predominate at the present moment, which explains sufficiently the present tendency away from the Extreme Left felt all over the country, as well as in Parliament.

In England, on the other hand, we witness a most interesting and important process of social readjustment, having taken lately a decidedly evolutionary line. There may yet be some revolutionary outbursts here and there, but there is no doubt whatever that the extreme teachings of Communism have not succeeded in capturing the sympathies of British Labor. The grievances will be settled and satisfied in a peaceful way by mutual concessions of both sides. Possibly the time is not so distant when we will see a Labor Cabinet at St. James', or one that is partly Labor and partly Liberal if of an aggressive type. Bolshevism in England is quite an impossible contingency, though only a few months ago one could consider a revolutionary outburst quite possible.

It is in Italy that Bolshevism has its best chance; the outbreak of a month ago was purely Bolshevik in its character, and the danger is by no way over; at any

moment a new Bolshevik outburst may come, even in the very near future. The interesting point is that Italians seem to be ashamed of it, and not only afraid of it. They diligently deny this, facts to the contrary notwithstanding. There is, however, an economic reason for this denial, namely, the absolute dependence of Italy on foreign coal and partly also on food. It is the dependence that makes Giolitti so suave and subservient in his talks with Lloyd-George. England can cut off Italy's coal supply at any moment; and, on the other hand, this same reason gives the Italian Premier great power over the Socialists and Radicals, who also realize what it means to Italy to lose her coal imports or parts of the food supplies. This is the only reason why Giolitti triumphed so easily over the Socialist opposition, which in no way likes him or his policy. The situation thus created is a very artificial one, social peace being maintained only by an outward casual factor. In such circumstances one can never be sure of the future developments, especially when social discontentment has already taken the form of Bolshevism.

In Germany, too, the situation is still very complicated, and one cannot be sure at all that the German people have finally overcome the Bolshevik danger, as it might have seemed last winter. The Polish imperialistic war has done much to resurrect German Bolshevism, and the influence of the Extreme Socialists (the so-called Independents) has lately increased in a considerable measure. How much power they really have, it is difficult to judge at this moment; but, considering the weakness of their opponents, there certainly is some danger. Yet there is a great difference between the positions of Germany and Italy, to the advantage of the former; the national spirit of the Germans is much cooler, the party discipline much stronger, the leaders more awake to the dangers of Bolshevism. Last, but not least, the personal acquaintance of the Germans with Russia and the state of Russian Bolshevism militates strongly against their adopting Lenine's policy; the experiences of Dittmar, made public a few weeks ago, are very significant in this respect; he came back from Russia absolutely disillusioned.

In Poland all will depend on her demeanor during these coming months; imperialism and foolishness might easily set her house on fire; the danger there is enormous, considering her internal troubles and the tremendous dissatisfaction of a majority of the population, coupled with great shortage of food. The Balkan States, on the other hand, have hardly much to fear from Bolshevism.

Summing up, we can say that Lenine's hopes for a world revolution will never be realized. I suppose he himself knows this by this time. But the general social dissatisfaction in European countries is still very great and might lead at any time to many serious disturbances. Bolshevik outbreaks, like the recent one in Italy, or even the establishment of a Bolshevik régime, with its soviets and all, will not and cannot affect all the nations, as some of them have already succeeded in finding the necessary antitoxin to this social disease. The important point, however, is this: in every single case the Bolshevik virus was fought successfully not by force, but only by education, by enlightening the people

and lessening social evils. France owes her salvation, for example, not to the militant policy of Millerand or Clemenceau, but to the common sense of her peasantry and her labor class, who did not want to follow the leadership of the Extremists. The English Labor Party finds its source of moderation exclusively in the education of its leaders. There is no doubt, on the other hand, that the frightful excesses of Bolshevism in Russia are made possible only on account of the uneducated state of the Russian masses.

## THE MISSION WORLD VIEWED FROM SWITZERLAND

### An International Missionary Meeting, Held at Crans, near Geneva, June 22-28

By WILLIAM E. STRONG, D. D.

IT WAS no such conference for size or spectacle as that held at Edinburgh in 1910. There was nothing big about it or showy; no crowded assemblies, or eloquent orations, or popular forthputtings. Instead, there were gathered only thirty-eight men, with a few ladies accompanying, who sat about a table in one room and deliberated in conversational tones and with informal remarks on the several topics brought before them.

Yet it was a great meeting and destined, it is believed, to have real effect upon the remaking of the world; for these thirty-eight men were from eleven countries and represented as many as eighty foreign missionary societies—American, British, and Continental. Inasmuch as several of these delegates were from the mission fields—from Japan, China, India, and Africa—it is not too much to say that Protestant Christendom, was reflected in this assembly. And there was weight to the representation. Such men were there as the English Bishop Westcott, Metropolitan of India and Ceylon and chairman of the India National Missionary Council; the American Bishop Roots, of Hankow, chairman of the China Continuation Committee, who was made chairman of this meeting; J. H. Oldham, of London, editor of the *International Review of Missions*, chosen secretary; John R. Mott, of New York, made chairman of the Business Committee; Dr. Ritson, of the British and Foreign Bible Society; Rev. Cecil Bardsley, of the Church Missionary Society; Bishop King, of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and Rev. Frank Lenwood, of the London Missionary Society; M. Couve and Dr. Allegret, of the Paris Evangelical Missionary Society; Dr. Anet, Secretary of the Belgian Missions to the Congo; Bishop Hennig, of Herrnhut; Professor Haussleiter, of Halle; Professor Richter, of Berlin, and Pastor Wurz, of Basel, representing unofficially various German societies; Drs. Gunning, of Holland, and Fries, of Sweden, and Professor Tome, of Denmark; Principal Gandier and Canon Gould, of Canada, and Drs. Watson (Presbyterian), Corey (Christian), Wolf (Lutheran), and Fennell P. Turner, secretary of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, from the United States.

That this group of men, leaders in national as well as church life, loyal each to his own land and type, could come together as soon after the war and enter into frank

discussion of subjects whereon they could but differ and whereon also they had strong convictions and prejudices, and that they could pursue these discussions without rancor or cleavage, to the securing of a common judgment as to what might be approved, was in itself an achievement to make every Christian heart rejoice. As was repeatedly expressed, it was wonderful what a spirit of mutual confidence and regard pervaded all the sessions; not only that, but how friendly and intimate were the conversations of the little groups of two or three who in the hours of relaxation strolled together about the grounds or found themselves side by side at the dining-tables—a better evidence of Christianity, it seemed, than some that are relied upon in natural theologies.

The discussions were not hackneyed. Their subjects were of pressing concern. They grew out of the World War, which in its shaking of the world has disturbed missionary work in many ways and to an extent not yet generally realized. For example, it has driven out from their fields of labor about one-eighth of the total number of foreign missionaries in the world. Of 2,500 men and women having care of German missions in the several countries where they have been planted, practically none remains at his post. For military reasons they have been excluded, interned, or, as in many cases, repatriated. Their work has been variously treated—temporarily transferred to the oversight of other missions, reorganized on an independent basis, or, too often, left uncared for and disrupted. Whatever may be said in defense of the action from a political standpoint, it is a heavy blow, not only to the genuine missionary devotion of a multitude of the German people, but to the Christian enterprise as a whole, to the progress of the Kingdom of God on earth. It would be intolerable that such a catastrophe should be disregarded or lightly accepted. As in successive sessions of this conference, we traced the situation following the war in one after another of the mission lands, hearts and minds became united in the feeling that here was a burden to be borne together and for whose lifting we must unitedly labor. Provision was made for laying the facts before all the mission boards, through their national organizations, with a view to finding a common plan of action for the relief of this distress.

Another burning question of the time grew out of the new situation faced by the educational work of foreign missions. Oriental governments are taking increased interest in popular education; are feeling its importance to national development; are becoming sensitive to and in some cases suspicious of the effect of mission schools and colleges in their influence upon the youth of the land. A more assertive nationalism is inclined to arrogate to the State entire control of education and to weaken or suppress those institutions which missions have founded and which have won popular confidence and patronage. In some cases it is boldly said that while religion is an affair of the church, education is an affair of the State and not to be meddled with by missions. Earnest and careful hours were given to a review of the educational situations in mission lands and to a consideration of the attitude which missionaries should take to this new temper that is appearing after the war.

The delicate but inevitable intermingling of missionary activities with political affairs furnished another